

# PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

REC'D 11 AUG 2006

WIPO

PCT

PCT

To:

see form PCT/ISA/220

## WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1)

		Date of mailing (day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)
Applicant's or agent's file reference see form PCT/ISA/220		<b>FOR FURTHER ACTION</b> See paragraph 2 below
International application No. PCT/JP2006/309185	International filing date (day/month/year) 26.04.2006	Priority date (day/month/year) 27.04.2005
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC INV. G06F17/30		
Applicant KABUSHIKI KAISHA TOSHIBA		

### 1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- Box No. II Priority
- Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

### 2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1b/s(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

### 3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA:   European Patent Office - Gitschner Str. 103 D-10958 Berlin Tel. +49 30 25901 - 0 Fax: +49 30 25901 - 840	Date of completion of this opinion  see form PCT/ISA/210	Authorized Officer  Barieux, M Telephone No. +49 30 25901-414
--	--	--



**Box No. I Basis of the opinion**

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of:  
 the international application in the language in which it was filed  
 a translation of the international application into \_\_\_\_\_, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (Rules 12.3(a) and 23.1 (b)).
2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
  - a. type of material:  
 a sequence listing  
 table(s) related to the sequence listing
  - b. format of material:  
 on paper  
 in electronic form
  - c. time of filing/furnishing:  
 contained in the international application as filed.  
 filed together with the international application in electronic form.  
 furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3.  In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.  
PCT/JP2006/309185

**Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or  
industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement**

**1. Statement**

Novelty (N)	Yes: Claims	1-18
	No: Claims	
Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims	1-18
	No: Claims	
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims	1-18
	No: Claims	

**2. Citations and explanations**

**see separate sheet**

**Re Item V**

**Reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability;  
citations and explanations supporting such statement**

1. Reference is made to the following document:

D1: "Reducing parts diversity in product design: a data centered approach"  
[Chochon, Ait-Ameur, Pierra, Potier], Proceedings of Concurrent Engineering,  
Special Track Data Integration in Engineering, pages 311-318, 26-30 July  
2003, Madeira, Portugal, retrieved from the Internet  
<URL:<http://www.lisi.ensma.fr/ftp/pub/documents/papers/2003/2003-CE2003-Chochon.pdf>> on 28 July 2006

2. The document D1 is regarded as being the closest prior art to the subject-matter of claim 1, and shows (the references in parentheses applying to this document):

A classification dictionary updating apparatus comprising:

~~an update proposal receiving unit that receives a proposal for updating a hierarchical classification dictionary which has a hierarchical structure which includes a class that defines the hierarchical structure, a property that defines a hierarchical class structure, and an attribute that is a detailed information field of the class and the property, and in which a sub classification class inherits a property of an upper classification class (paragraph 3.5 "The PLIB model");~~

The subject-matter of claim 1 differs from D1 in that:

- the classification dictionary is updated
- a proposal history storing unit stores the past received proposal;
- an approximate proposal extracting unit extracts the past received proposal stored by the proposal history storing unit approximate to the latest received proposal; and
- an approximate proposal presenting unit presents the extracted proposal.

The subject-matter of claim 1 is therefore new (Article 33(2) PCT).

The problem to be solved by the present invention may be regarded as how to manage update proposals to a classification dictionary.

The solution to this problem proposed in claim 1 of the present application is considered as involving an inventive step (Article 33(3) PCT because none of the available prior art discloses or suggests to solve the problem as described by the above differentiating features.

The same reasoning applies to independent claims 17 and 18 which disclose a computer program product and a method corresponding to claim 1.

3. Claims 2 to 16 are dependent on claim 1 and as such also meet the requirements of the PCT with respect to novelty and inventive step.